

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **30 August 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 15, 17-19, 21-24, 26, 28-30, 32, and 33. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10-13, 15, 17-19, 21-24, 26, 28-30, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhagat (USPN 6,782,410, hereinafter “Bhagat”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 12, and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bhagat. Applicant respectfully points out that Bhagat teaches **grouping processes** executing in a multi-processor computer into “collections” such that all of the processes in a given collection share the same processor affinity (see Bhagat, col. 2, line 64 to col. 3, line 12).

In contrast, the present invention **groups resources into resource pools** that include CPUs and memory, swap space, network interfaces, and/or scheduling classes (see FIG. 2 and page 7, line 12 to page 8, line 10 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows a given process to be assigned to one or more resource pools depending on system and process requirements, which allows high-priority processes to be assigned to an individual resource pool and other low-priority processes to share another resource pool. The system of Bhagat provides for assigning the same processor affinity to related processes in a given collection to enhance cache coherency. There is nothing within Bhagat, either explicit or implicit, which suggests grouping resources into resource pools that include CPUs and memory, swap space, network interfaces, and/or scheduling classes.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, and 23 to clarify that the present invention groups resources into resource pools that include CPUs and memory, swap space, network interfaces, and/or scheduling classes.


These amendments find support in FIG. 2 and on page 7, line 12 to page 8, line10 of the instant application

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, and 23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2, 4, 6-8, and 10-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13, 15, 17-19, and 21-22, which depend upon claim 12, and claims 24, 26, 28-30, and 32-33, which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 13 October 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com